

**Minutes**  
**April 7, 2016**  
**North End - Huntington Heights Architectural Review Board**

**Members present:**

Norwood Groce, Carolyn Hughes, Mary Kayaselcuk, Gardner Snead, Phil Shook

**Members Absent:** Russell Beck, Karl Dahlen

**Staff present:** Saul Gleiser

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.

Minutes of the March 3, 2016 meeting were reviewed and approved.

**New Business**

COA-16-286 Andrew Beale. 343 57th Street. The request is for a COA that will allow the replacement of windows, sidings and doors.

Mr. Beale addressed thanked the Board for taking time to review the proposed work at the previous meeting, and thanked staff for their input and effort.

Each item was discussed and voted on individually.

**Siding**

The guidelines were reviewed in context with the request. It was noted that the house had vinyl over wood that was installed prior to the formation of the architectural review board. This old vinyl siding has been removed. The new vinyl double 5 siding will cover the house and garage with vinyl cedar shake shingle on the front upper story dormer. The profile will be between 5 and 8 inches. The railing and knee walls on the front second story will need to be increased in height in order to meet code. It was noted that building code requirements supersede the guidelines.

Ms. Kayaselcuk made the motion to approve.

Mr. Groce provided the second.

Motion approved

Aye: 5

Nay: 0

**Doors**

The guidelines were reviewed in context with the request. The original front lower story door had a raised two panel six light window. The replacement door is proposed to be a raised two panel door with a single "art glass" insert in the door. Mr. Shook noted that the style was consistent with the historical period.

The original upper story door was a single light door with a storm door with 1/1 double-hung windows on both sides. The proposed replacement door is a 3/5 muntins pattern and the side replacement windows will retain the 1/1 windows. The board noted that the 3/5 pattern was not historically appropriate to the craftsman style and that the single light is more appropriate.

Mr. Groce made a motion to approve to approve the door with the modification that the 3/5 grid shall be removed, leaving a single pane of glass.

Ms. Kayaselcuk provided the second.

Motion approved

Aye: 5

Nay: 0

#### Windows

The guidelines were reviewed in context with the request. It was noted that the casement windows in the rear were installed when the addition was constructed prior to the formation of the ARB.

The remaining windows will be replaced with like styled 1/1 double hung windows.

Mr. Shook noted that the existing window in the garage had been paneled over and asked the applicant what his desires were in regard to installing a window, or continue with paneling over.

The applicant stated that he would like to have a window there, but he would like it to be larger than the existing window opening. The board noted that a double hung window matching those used on the house would be appropriate, with a size determined by the homeowner.

Mr. Groce made a motion to approve.

Mr. Snead provided the second.

Motion approved

Aye: 5

Nay: 0

David Richardson approached the board in regard to his property located on the south corner of 59<sup>th</sup> Street and Warwick Boulevard. He would like to build a garage or shed on his property and came to ask the board for advice and clarification of requirements. He also mentioned a proposal to modify the driveway. Mr. Richardson was advised to talk to the Department of Engineering about requirements for expanding/constructing a new driveway apron. It was also noted that a garage/shed can be built on the documented historical footprint of a former garage using the historical setbacks. It was noted that the footprint can be expanded to the interior of the property, but not closer to the property line. Mr. Richardson was advised to consult with the Department of Codes Compliance to confirm that the proposed location for the accessory structure is permissible.

The board noted that the roofline of the accessory structure need not match the roof line of the principal structure. The board reviewed possible considerations for window(s), doors, and siding for the structure, noting that new construction should be complementary to the original architectural style of the principal structure.

The applicant mentioned that he was stripping the paint off his house as part of the rehabilitation process. The board cautioned him that almost all houses in the area have lead paint. Stripping the paint presents an opportunity for significant hazard both for those doing the work and people in the surrounding area. A recommendation was made to go to the EPA website and research lead paint mitigation for appropriate methods for dealing with this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM.